UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD	
XILINX, INC. Petitioner	

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC
Patent Owner

v.

\_\_\_\_\_

Case IPR2013-00029 Patent 5,632,545

PATENT OWNER INTELLECTUAL VENTURES' MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY OF A. BRUCE BUCKMAN, Ph.D.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TAB	LE OI	F AUTHORITIES	ii
I.	INTI	RODUCTION	1
II.	PRO	CEDURAL HISTORY	1
III.	BEC PRO	BUCKMAN'S OPINIONS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED AUSE HE IS NOT QUALIFIED TO TESTIFY AS TO VIDEO JECTION AND LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAYS, AND HIS NIONS ARE UNRELIABLE.	3
	A.	Dr. Buckman Is Not Qualified To Offer Expert Testimony	4
	B.	As Evidenced By His Ever-Changing Opinions About The Location Of The Video Controller In Lee, Dr. Buckman's Opinions Are Unreliable And Should Be Excluded	9
IV.	CON	ICLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED	12



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

## **Cases**

Ancho v. Pentek Corp., 157 F.3d 512 (7th Cir. 1998)	4
Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993)	
Diviero v. Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Co., 919 F. Supp. 1352 (D. Ariz. 1996), aff'd, 114 F.3d 851 (9th Cir. 1997)	5
Kumho Tire Co., Ltd. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999)	2, 3
Mukhtar v. California State Univ., Hayward, 299 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2002)	4
Oglesby v. General Motors Corp., 190 F.3d 244 (4th Cir. 1990)	4-5
Shreve v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 166 F. Supp. 2d 378 (D. Md. 2001)	4
Sundance, Inc. v. Demonte Fabricating Ltd., 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	9
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 1.68	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.62	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)	1, 3
Fed. R. Evid. 702	1. 2. 3. 12



## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Xilinx, Inc.'s proffered expert, A. Bruce Buckman, Ph.D., lacks the "knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education" to offer opinions about the pertinent art, namely, video projection and, more specifically, liquid crystal, displays. Fed. R. Evid. 702; see 37 C.F.R. § 42.62 (applying Federal Rules of Evidence to IPR proceedings). This is exemplified by the fact that Dr. Buckman has now changed his opinion—on where the claimed "video controller" is disclosed in the "Lee" prior art reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,131)—three times.

Because Dr. Buckman's opinions are unreliable and would not help the Board "understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue," Fed. R. Evid. 702, patent owner Intellectual Ventures I LLC moves pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) to exclude Dr. Buckman's opinions in Exhibits 1012 and 1013.

### II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On October 19, 2012, Xilinx filed its petition for *inter partes* review in this proceeding. (Paper 1.)

On March 12, 2013, the Board issued its Decision to institute *inter partes* review. (Paper 11.)

On September 12, 2013, Xilinx filed its Opposition to Motion to Amend the Claims (Paper 26), and a supporting "Declaration of A. Bruce Buckman, Ph.D. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 Directed to the Proposed Substitute Claims" (Exhibit



1012). Paper 26 relies extensively on the Buckman Declaration (Exhibit 1012). (*See* 9/12/13 Xilinx Opposition (Paper 26) at 5, 7-15.)

On September 12, 2013, Xilinx also filed its Reply Brief in Support of Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. 5,632,545 (Paper 27), and a supporting declaration entitled "Reply Report of Dr. A. Bruce Buckman" (Exhibit 1013). Paper 27 relies extensively on the Buckman Declaration (Exhibit 1013). (*See* 9/12/13 Xilinx Reply Brief (Paper 27) at 4, 6, 8-15.)

On September 13, 2013, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), patent owner Intellectual Ventures I LLC timely served and filed objections to Exhibits 1012 and 1013 under, among other things, Federal Rule of Evidence 702 because "Dr. Buckman lacks expertise in the relevant field and his testimony does not measure up to the standards set by *Daubert . . . Kumho Tire . . .* and their progeny." (Paper 28 at 1.)

On September 16, 2013, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2), Xilinx filed a Notice of Supplemental Evidence (Paper 29), submitting a Supplemental Declaration of Dr. A. Bruce Buckman (Exhibit 1021) in response to patent owner's September 13, 2013 objections to Exhibits 1012 and 1013.

On September 18, 2013, patent owner filed its Second Objection to Evidence, noting that the versions of Exhibits 1012 and 1013 that were filed on September 12, 2013 were missing a number of figures. (Paper 30.)



# DOCKET

# Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

# **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

# **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

# **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

### API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

#### **LAW FIRMS**

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

#### **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## **E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

